

## ***Interactive comment on “The Flat Earth satire, using science theatre to debunk absurd theories”***

**by George Sand Fran a et al.**

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 18 June 2020

The paper “The Flat Earth satire, using science theatre to debunk absurd theories” deals with a way to answer to the flat Earth theory through a comic theatre show. The idea and scope of the show are certainly interesting and praiseworthy. However, the paper completely fails to give the show justice. First of all, the form is unsuitable for a scientific paper: the English language is plenty of mistakes, many sentences are too long or badly constructed, often unclear. Furthermore, the language is often more suitable to a newspaper than a scientific paper. I underlined some examples of sentences that need to be rewritten but actually the whole paper would need a professional scientific English editing. Another big issue is the content. The paper only superficially scratches what the show is about. There is no way to have an independent opinion about the effectiveness of the show, nor it is possible to reproduce it (which is

C1

a fundamental part of a revision process). In this way the usefulness to the readers is also questionable. Finally, the references should also include some studies about science and art, communication and teaching. These are fields where researches are certainly not lacking.

Following are some specific comments. For future submissions please keep the line numbers throughout all the document: Line 16: you talk about theories but the fact that the Earth is not flat is more than a theory. Please correct. Line 26-28: correct the English as follows: “The show impacts the community in a funny way, offering the opportunity for a new experience to the population” 46-47: please rephrase and check English. 47: what do you mean with “Sciences have no actions or initiatives”? This seems like a slogan. Please, explain it or delete it. 49: I might disagree. There is plenty of books and scientific divulgators on TV addressing adults. My impression is quite the opposite. Please cite some data or sources backing up your statement or change it. 49-52: check the punctuation, the sentence is too long. 52-56: I believe you mean exhausting and not exhaustive. In any case it is a self-pitying consideration. This whole sentence should be rewritten in correct English and in a more appropriate language for a scientific journal. 66: cited as Palma in the reference list. 80: you must explain what is a mamulengo. 81: will be disturbed? Please explain better. And the slides? Explaining what? 92: white, not wine. 81-98: this is a very general description of the show. In practice we have no idea of the contents and the readers cannot decide for themselves whether the show can be effective or not. Also, it is not possible to reproduce it. Page 4: what do you mean here “happened through several partners”? Page 4: this sentence is not clear (the audience leads you to a greater understanding?); moreover, the “understanding with laughter” is a slogan, not suitable for a scientific journal: “This result brings us to believe that we have an audience with excellent knowledge and that apparently can lead us to greater understanding with laughter”. Page 4: here you introduce new elements, such as that the show is not ready, but it is not clear why. The whole paragraph should be rewritten: “As for the comments, the highlight is that the show is not ready yet, although all this result, especially the end

C2

of the show and why we use of the “mamulengos”. That it was necessary in order to highlight the training of the actor in terms of qualification in science. The need to further highlight the issue of the flat Earth. Performance problem, p.e. physical preparation was also highlighted. With these comments, we are updating the play to seek the best show.” Page 5-6: again, this is not a language suitable for a scientific paper: “participate in these activities, there is no recognition or accounting for your academic careers”.

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-19>, 2020.

C3